

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,647	10/06/2003	Daniel Simoen	КОВ	7814
7590 10/04/2005		EXAMINER		
James C. Wray			EVANS, GEOFFREY S	
Suite 300 1493 Chain Bridge Road			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
McLean, VA 22101			1725	
			DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004	•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

W	1
	_

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/678,647	SIMOEN, DANIEL		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Geoffrey S. Evans	1725		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address –		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or				
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction in the original sheet (s) including the original sheet (s) includin	epted or b) objected to by the lidrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20040205.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:			

Application/Control Number: 10/678,647 Page 2

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because "and/of" is unclear.
 Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

- 2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1 on line 9 the meaning of "and/of" is unclear, was "and/or" meant? In claim 2 on line 4 it is assumed that Applicant does not intend to invoke 35 USC 112, sixth paragraph. Respectfully suggest deleting "means of" in claim 2 on line 4. Similarly in claim 3 on line 3 "means of" should be deleted. In claim 7 it is confusing whether "(or flat steel)" is being positively recited. Please delete the parentheses or the entire expression to obviate this rejection.
- 3. Claim 1 recites a method of manufacturing components with an intended use that the components be used in a weaving machine since the phrase "weaving machine" is only in the preamble. In claim 6 on line 5 the parenthetic expression "for instance, a stepped shape" has been given no patentable weight
- 4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wagner et al. in U.S. Patent No. 5,809,647. Wagner et al. discloses laser welding two components of stainless steel and copper that have different sizes and different

Application/Control Number: 10/678,647

Art Unit: 1725

mechanical and magnetic properties that as a component is capable of being used in a weaving machine.

Page 3

- 6. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bowen et al. in U.S. Patent No. 4,404,995. Bowen et al. discloses welding extruded aluminum slats (see column 3,lines 17-18) to studs (made of stainless steel to resist corrosion; see column 3,line 48) to form part of a component.
- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowen et al. in U.S. Patent No. 4,404,995. The size of the component in Bowne et al. is considered a matter of design choice depending upon the other components in the weaving machine.
- 9. Claims 2 and 5-7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Koch in U.S. Patent No. 4,901,767 has sections of sheet metal of differing sizes laser welded together.

Application/Control Number: 10/678,647 Page 4

Art Unit: 1725

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Geoffrey S Evans whose telephone number is (571)-272-1174. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:30AM to 4:00 PM, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (571)-272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

GSE

Primary Examiner
Group 1700